

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 12-25 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 5-11 are now pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application is earnestly requested.

The Office Action Summary (page 1) did not indicate whether the drawings recently filed have been accepted or objected to by the Examiner. Formal drawings have been filed and Applicant requests that in a next communication the Examiner indicate that these drawings have been accepted.

35 USC §112 Rejection of Claim 5

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendment to claim 5 addresses the rejection based on use of the term "may."

The Office action also rejects claim 5 as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. The Office action queries "what happens if the second computer file is not a later version of the first computer file, but is a completely independent file?" Respectfully, Applicant would like to point out that this query is directed toward a situation that Applicant is not currently claiming.

It is correct to note that, in general, given a first computer file and a second computer file, it is entirely possible that the second computer file will not be later version of the first file. In this situation, a user would receive two files and would also receive an indication that the second computer file is not a version of the first file. But, Applicant is not addressing that situation in claim 5. Claim 5 addresses the specific situation in which an indication is received that the second computer file is in fact a later version of the first computer file. Once so indicated, the invention of claim 5 then proceeds to create a mapping table, etc., in order to enable forward navigation from the first file to the second file. Applicant submits that there is no missing step because the second file is a version of the first file.

In the situation about which the Office action queries, a user would indicate that the second file is not a version of the first file. But, claim 5 does not address that situation. In other words, what we have is claim 5 addressing one particular situation, while the Office action queries what would happen in a different situation. Claim 5 is not missing a step because it addresses one particular situation.

35 USC §102 Rejection of Claims 5-11

The Office action has rejected claims 5-11 under §102(b) as being anticipated by *Hussam* (U.S. patent application publication No. US 2003/0050927). Although the Examiner's arguments have been carefully considered, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as explained below.

At the outset, it is noted that claim 5 addresses forward navigation in a content space that enables a user to navigate forward through the content space formed by the first and second computer files. A content space may be, for example, a set of documents having various versions. While *Hussam* discloses the existence of a universe of pre-existing documents and discusses "metadata" at length, there are no other similarities between *Hussam* and the claimed invention. *Hussam* concerns itself with searching through the universe of documents using a search term or keywords in order to return the relevant documents (paragraph 77) but does not address navigating through versions of documents. Therefore, it is not surprising that many of the features of the claimed invention are not present in *Hussam*.

Claim 5 requires "receiving a first message digest," "receiving a second message digest" and "creating a third message digest." Not only does the term "message digest" have a specific meaning in the art, but also its meaning is defined very specifically at page 10, lines 21-31 (and elaborated upon elsewhere) in the present application. The existence of a message digest as required by claim 5 is nowhere disclosed nor even suggested anywhere in the disclosure of *Hussam*.


Claim 5 also requires "receiving an indication that said second computer file is a later version of said first computer file." Applicant can find no disclosure in paragraphs 10 or 83 showing that somehow a second file is indicated as being a later version of the first file.

Claim 5 further requires "creating a descriptor file that includes said first message digest and said second message digest." Again, *Hussam* nowhere discloses use of message digests.

Claim 5 also requires "returning said third message digest to a user." *Hussam* nowhere discloses returning a message digest to a user that identifies the descriptor file.

Reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution, please do not hesitate to telephone the undersigned at (612) 252-3330.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP



Jonathan O. Scott
Registration No. 39,364

BEYER WEAVER LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

Telephone: (612) 252-3330
Facsimile: (612) 825-6304